

**REMARKS / ARGUMENTS**

The present application includes pending claims 1-17, all of which have been rejected. The Applicant respectfully submits that the claims define patentable subject matter.

Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-13, and 15-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,052,000, issued to Wang et al. (hereinafter, Wang). Claims 4, 9, and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang in view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2003/0123586, issued to Yen (hereinafter, Yen). Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang in view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2004/0125884, issued to Wei et al. (hereinafter, Wei). The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections at least based on the following remarks.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

**I. Wang Does Not Anticipate Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-13, and 15-16**

The Applicant first turns to the rejection of claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-13, and 15-16 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wang. With regard to the anticipation rejections under 102, MPEP 2131 states that “[a] claim is anticipated only if **each and every element** as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” See Manual of Patent Examining Procedure

(MPEP) at 2131 (internal citation omitted). Furthermore, “[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.” See id. (internal citation omitted).

**A. Rejection of Independent Claims 1, 6, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

With regard to the rejection of independent claim 1 under 102(b), the Applicant submits that Wang does not disclose or suggest at least the limitation of “removing post cursor inter-symbol interference **within at least one error correction code word** in a block code based error correction scheme,” as recited by the Applicant in independent claim 1 (emphasis added).

The Office Action states the following:

As per claim 1, Wang et al teaches a method for equalization in a communications system, the method comprising: removing post cursor inter-symbol interference within at least one error correction code word in a block code based error correction scheme (see abstract and fig.2 element 210 and col. 1, lines 63-67 and col. 5, lines 13-38), wherein said block code based error correction scheme is utilized in the communication system (see col2, lines 18-20).

See the Office Action at page 2. The Applicant respectfully disagrees. The Office Action relies for support on the Abstract, FIG. 2, col. 1 and col. 5 of Wang.

Wang, at the Abstract, discloses that decision feedback equalization and error correction coding are realized in a communications system by the use of a plurality of coders and decoders. More specifically, **Wang, in FIG. 2, discloses the use of error**

**correction codes only with regard to the encoder 204 and the decoder 218.** See Wang at FIG. 2 and col. 7, lines 65-68. Wang, at col. 1, lines 63-67, simply discloses that combining decision feedback equalization and error correction coding may provide a greater benefit than either technique alone. Wang, at col. 5, lines 13-38, discloses the shortcomings of the decision feedback equalizer (DFE) 210 when compared to a linear equalizer.

In this regard, Wang, including the Abstract, FIG. 2, col. 1 and col. 5, does not disclose or suggest any processing with regard to an error correction code word. In fact, as stated above, Wang discloses the use of error correction codes only with regard to the encoder 204 and the decoder 218. Therefore, the Applicant maintains that Wang does not disclose or suggest at least the limitation of “removing post cursor inter-symbol interference within at least one error correction code word in a block code based error correction scheme,” as recited by the Applicant in independent claim 1.

Accordingly, independent claim 1 is not anticipated by Wang and is allowable. Independent claims 6 and 11 are similar in many respects to the method disclosed in independent claim 1. Therefore, the Applicant submits that independent claims 6 and 11 are also allowable over the references cited in the Office Action at least for the reasons stated above with regard to claim 1.

**B. Rejection of Dependent Claims 2-3, 5, 7-8, 10, 12-13, and 15-16**

Based on at least the foregoing, the Applicant believes the rejection of independent claims 1, 6 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Wang has been overcome and requests that the rejection be withdrawn. Additionally, claims 2-3, 5, 7-8, 10, 12-13, and 15-16 depend from independent claims 1, 6 and 11, and are, consequently, also respectfully submitted to be allowable.

The Applicant also reserves the right to argue additional reasons beyond those set forth above to support the allowability of claims 2-3, 5, 7-8, 10, 12-13, and 15-16.

**II. Rejection of Dependent Claims 4, 9, and 14**

Based on at least the foregoing, the Applicant believes the rejection of independent claims 1, 6 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Wang has been overcome and requests that the rejection be withdrawn. Additionally, since the additional cited reference (Yen) does not overcome the deficiencies of Wang, claims 4, 9, and 14 depend from independent claims 1, 6, and 11, respectively, and are, consequently, also respectfully submitted to be allowable.

The Applicant also reserves the right to argue additional reasons beyond those set forth above to support the allowability of claims 4, 9, and 14.

**III. Rejection of Dependent Claim 17**

Application № 10/773,610  
Reply to Office Action of 03/19/2008

Based on at least the foregoing, the Applicant believes the rejection of independent claims 1, 6 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Wang has been overcome and requests that the rejection be withdrawn. Additionally, since the additional cited reference (Wei) does not overcome the deficiencies of Wang, claim 17 depends from independent claim 11, and is, consequently, also respectfully submitted to be allowable.

The Applicant also reserves the right to argue additional reasons beyond those set forth above to support the allowability of claim 17.

Application № 10/773,610  
Reply to Office Action of 03/19/2008

**CONCLUSION**

Based on at least the foregoing, the Applicant believes that all claims 1-17 are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner disagrees, the Applicant respectfully requests a telephone interview, and requests that the Examiner telephone the undersigned Attorney at (312) 775-8176.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to the deposit account of McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd., Account No. 13-0017.

A Notice of Allowability is courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 19-JUN-2008

/Ognyan I. Beremski/

Ognyan Beremski, Esq.  
Registration No. 51,458  
Attorney for Applicant

McANDREWS, HELD & MALLOY, LTD.  
500 WEST MADISON STREET, 34TH FLOOR  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60661  
(312) 775-8000

/ OIB